UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

"The Castle"—New Home of the Beverly Unitarian Church
Longwood Drive at 103rd Street, Chicago

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 2

Chicago, April, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Edwin A. R. Rumball-Petre: Author and lecturer; authority on rare Bibles.

F. H. Amphlett Micklewright: Unitarian minister now preaching in The Little Chapel, Avenue Congregational Church, Southampton, England—the building of The Church of the Saviour (Unitarian) having been destroyed by enemy action.

Archie J. Bahm: Professor of Philosophy, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

Elizabeth Arthur Mann: Graduate of Ohio State University in 1939, and recipient of a Master's Degree in 1940 from the University of Alabama.

David Jobman: Veteran of the first World War; author of "Democracy Triumphant," appearing in *The Book of Modern Poetry,* 1941.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 19

ARTICLES—

An Extraordinary Religion—EDWIN A. R. RUMBALL-PETRE 22

The Flight from Reason—F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT 26

Religion Is Natural—ARCHIE J. BAHM 27

The Promise of an Unconquerable France—DAVID JOBMAN 29

POETRY—

Definition—MIMS THORNBURGH WORKMAN 27

Cry of the Unknown Soldier of Today—ELIZABETH ARTHUR MANN 28

THE STUDY TABLE—

The Return to the Cross / A Spiritual Ministry —C. A. HAWLEY 32

CORRESPONDENCE—

"Mere Nose-Counting" in Plan for Union Now—D. H. SWEET .. 32

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Ninetieth Annual Session of the Western Unitarian Conference
May 10-12, 1942

General Theme: "The Religious Roots of Democracy."

The First Unitarian Church
5015 Waterman Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri

Sunday, May 10

8:00 P. M.—Conference Sermon—Jacob Trapp.

Monday, May 11

10:00 A. M.—Business Session.
Address of Welcome—Laurance Plank.
Report of the Treasurer—D. I. Jarrett.
Address of the President—Curtis W. Reese.

11:00 A. M.—Platform Meeting.
John Malick and Edwin H. Buehrer.

12:30 P. M.—Ministers' Luncheon.
Chairman, E. Burdette Backus.
Addresses, R. Lester Mondale and Sydney B. Snow.
Alliance Luncheon.

3:30 P. M.—Sight-seeing Tour.

6:00 P. M.—Religious Education Supper.
Chairman, Gladys H. Hilton.
Address, Ernest Kuebler.

8:00 P.M.—Platform Meeting.
Willard L. Johnson, Jewish Christian Round Table; Joseph A. McClain, Washington University.

Tuesday, May 12

10:00 A. M.—Business Session.

11:00 A. M.—Panel.
Clinton L. Scott, Gerald Weary, Charles E. Snyder, and Evans Worthley.

1:00 P. M.—Luncheon of the U. F. S. J.
Chairman, Randall S. Hilton.
Address, "The Religious Roots of Civil Liberties"—Donald Harrington.

3:00 P. M.—Western Branch of the Unitarian Historical Society.
Chairman, Robert M. Pratt.
Address, "William Ellery Channing"—Charles H. Lyttle.

6:30 P. M.—Annual Banquet.
Toastmaster, Isaac Hedges.
Toasts, Randall Hilton, Laurance Plank, Merrill O. Bates and Von Ogden Vogt.

Information

The St. Louis church has generously offered hospitality to all delegates who wish to be entertained in the homes of members. Requests for hospitality should be addressed to the office of the church as early as possible—5015 Waterman Avenue St. Louis, Mo. Delegates not accepting hospitality should make their own reservations at the Park Plaza Hotel, 220 North Kingshighway or at Hotel Kingsway, 108 North Kingshighway, St. Louis, Mo.

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII APRIL, 1942 No. 2

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

It is a triumph for the democratic principle that a Congressional election by a free people is to be held in this country this fall in the midst of a great war. It is to be hoped that Americans will use vigorously this exercise of freedom which the dictators would not, because they dare not, grant to their citizens. The champions of this war, the bitter-enders who would fight it through to any end of disaster that might imaginatively be called victory, will use these elections to the utmost service of their cause, we may be sure of that. They will insist upon the nomination of pro-war candidates and the support of these candidates as a test of patriotism, while condemning every Congressman who has dared to reserve to himself any independence of judgment in matters of war and peace. Think what they will try to do, for example, to Miss Jeannette Rankin! If there is to be any true election, there must of course be an opposition; and this opposition, in this country exactly as in England, must center its forces upon the issue of ending the war at the earliest possible moment on the basis of negotiation. More specifically, there must be unhesitating and unhidden opposition to the administration, which is now an out-and-out war administration. In England, opposition between the Tory and Labor parties is all but at an end, since both of these parties are in favor of fighting the war until the Empire is saved. In the same way, in this country, opposition between the Democrats and Republicans has practically ended, except in the case of covert political sniping on the part of anti-New Dealers which is a disgrace to all concerned. But in England, the opposition between the pro-war and anti-war forces, based upon sincere and fundamental conviction as to the character of this war and of all wars in general, is perfectly open, and under the law is given free and full expression—and the same should be true of this country! And the Congressional election this fall, like any chance by-election in England, presents the opportunity to citizens to express themselves. Let candidates appear in every district to plead for the ending of this war, to advocate the immediate calling of a world conference to negotiate a peace in which America shall take the lead, to present a program of peace which will challenge the attention of the world. Unless the Congressional election is to be a mere going through the constitutional motions, a real opposition to the administration must appear. And, who knows, an opposition might be placed in Congress to stand up to Roosevelt, as James Maxton and his associates in Parliament stand up to Churchill!

II

The spectacle of Mr. Churchill offering the promise of dominion status to India is so sensational, and the journey of Sir Stafford Cripps to India is so happy an arrangement, that one is tempted to elation over this latest development in the prolonged drama in the Far East. But the statement of Gandhi should not be necessary to remind us that all this contains no solution of the Indian problem. Dominion status has been promised before—in the last war, for example, when it was promptly withdrawn in favor of the notorious Rowlett Acts after the war was over. It was promised again in this war—in 1940, when it failed utterly to win the support of the Indian people. Why Mr. Churchill or anybody else should think that this offer can avail anything now, especially when coupled with the old subterfuge about the Indians agreeing among themselves as to the nature of home rule, is more than I can understand. For clear as crystal is it today that nothing will satisfy India but immediate independence —which means that India must be free to fashion and control her own government, and thus to join the United Nations on her own volition, on a basis of complete equality, in their war against the Axis! A recent issue of the English weekly, the *New Statesman and Nation,* states the case perfectly:

> The Chinese people [writes the editor] have fought bravely through four years to keep a freedom they won by revolution. They could do this because they had at the head as president of their republic and commander of their armies a leader of their own. What Britain asks of India is to fight not for herself but for the British Empire, under a Scottish nobleman.

This will not be done! If we are to hold the allegiance of India, says this great London journal, *"we must give India a national government today."* How England can hesitate to make this grant of independence, when Chiang Kai-shek has met Nehru, and joined China to India in the latter's plea for liberty, is again not understandable. For if anything is apparent today in the Far East, it is that western rule is done for. No matter how this war comes out, the western powers must withdraw. If Japan wins, they will of course be ousted. If the United Nations win, they will retire before the united front of a China and India determined to be free. The one most important event since the war began, said Prof. Nathaniel Peffer the other day, was the meeting of Chiang and Nehru, since this event marked the end of the era of imperialistic exploitation, and the beginning of a new era of an emancipated Asia. So Mr. Churchill might as well go "the whole hog." As was proclaimed in the last issue of UNITY—*"Free India now!"*

III

The terrific crisis for India is quite as much a crisis for Gandhi and the non-violent movement which is the immortal achievement of his life. Happy as we all must be that independence for India is now at hand, there must remain for pacifists the challenge to see to it that an entry into war does not subdue Indians to the tyranny of the war machine. This must have been the thought central in Gandhi's mind when, in resigning from the headship of the All-India Congress, he made plain his intention to continue his anti-war propaganda and to enlist such men and women as would go along with him in this campaign. Not to oppose or thwart Britain, but to keep alive the non-violent sentiment of his countrymen! The *Christian Pacifist,* of London, has an important editorial on this very point in its January issue, recently received in this country. Declaring that, if political autonomy is won for India, "we must all rejoice in it....as an act of wise justice, which up to a point will bear good fruit," the editor points out that "more important than political independence to the pacifist, as it is, we believe, to Mr. Gandhi, is independence from the distrust and fear, from the readiness to hurt and kill in self-defense, which underlie the corporate use of the hideous war machines today constituting the armaments of a nation." If India goes into the war, then

> Our chief hopes must surely be set on the maintenance and recruitment, under the leadership of the far-seeing Gandhi, of at least a devoted nucleus, a "remnant" in Isaiah's language, of single-minded *satyagrahis,* who will continue to do all they can, in the realm especially of prayer and thought, to save India from the disaster of ensnarement in the network of armaments, of power-politics, of the mass-produced machinery of capitalism and destruction, by which the other great nations are throttled. We must pray above all that such a company of Indian men and women, in close touch with religious-minded pacifists the world over, may rise above the general demoralization of war to continue to build up the foundations of slowly expanding pacifist communities. . .

It is just this idea of the "saving remnant" which I have tried to set forth in my new book, *Out of Darkness* (Harper's). We have no Gandhi in England or in this country to lead us, but the work must still be done here as in India.

IV

The question of feeding starving Europe will not down. Starvation will not let it down! The facts, getting more horrible every hour, are shaking the conscience of a world not yet so immune to horror as to witness unmoved the suffering and death of a whole continent. Greece seems to be the center of the worst agony. Direct reports are to the effect that people are dropping dead in the streets of Athens at the rate of five hundred a day, while all over the countryside the highways are cumbered with lifeless or fainting bodies. Conditions in Poland have long since been beyond description. Yet they came with a new sense of dismay in the pictures recently published in *Life* magazine. Naked and wasted corpses, those of children among them, piled up in masses like logs of wood! These two countries are only samples of what is going on progressively all over Europe. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, France, Czechoslovakia, all are moving swiftly to this desperate plight! What wonder that no less a man than the Hon. Hugh Gibson, late ambassador to Belgium and a diplomat of great renown and influence, has been prompted to protest in an article in the *Saturday Evening Post.* It is not enough to say, writes Mr. Gibson, that the Nazis are responsible for this starvation, though it is true that, if Europe must starve, the Germans will be the last to perish. What is really decisive in the food situation is the British-American blockade. "The purpose of the food blockade is to harm Germany. Its effect is to harm our friends and allies, already the victims of Nazi aggression." For "food is a weapon," says Mr. Gibson, and the Nazis are using it terribly in this case. Thus, it is famine which is herding great masses of men from the occupied countries into German war industries. It is famine which is enabling Hitler to build up a Europe united against us in suspicion and resentment. For it is an utter fallacy that the starving millions blame the Nazis for their condition. They blame the blockade as evidence that their former allies and friends have deserted them. Says Mr. Gibson:

> Even if I knew in advance that the Germans would violate their undertakings and seize all the food they could get, I would still want to try it [feeding the people of the conquered countries]. For in that event Britain would have a perfectly clear case of having done her best to get food to the needy, and would place the responsibility for failure square upon the Germans.

V

The liquor situation is beginning to "get" me. It is such a scandal in a crisis described as involving the very question of the life and death of our civilization.

Look at England, for example, where the whole war may turn on the problem of feeding the people! In a recent issue of *Zion's Herald* we find a statement by an Englishman, Mr. Ernest Winterton, former M.P., to the effect that "1800 tons of barley every day last year found its way to brewers' vats." Think that over, dear friends!—1800 *tons* a DAY!! And every day the English people subsist on ration cards which provide a minimum of the necessities of life. What wonder that Mr. Winterton speculates about "the cheese, eggs, and meat stuffs which could have been available for the workers if the farmers and poultry-keepers could have had [this barley]." He might well have extended his speculations to include the ships desperately struggling to get through the Atlantic blockade with—barley for brewers, instead of milk for babies or wheat for bread! How can such a situation be tolerated—barley turned into beer, which in turn is poured into workers to befuddle their wits, weaken their bodies, and in general make them less efficient for the huge job of production? And what about the tens of thousands of workers busy in the breweries instead of on the farms, or in the factories, or on the railroads? Of course, there is the fine old myth, zealously propagated by the liquor interests, that beer is a food. Then there is the silly talk about morale—as though booze were not the worst foe of true morale that we have to wrestle with! Omnipresent is the economic argument—that the government needs the revenues from liquor taxes. But suppose we balance against these revenues the hundred of millions of dollars expense laid upon society by the poverty, crime, insanity, and general disorder and trouble created by the liquor traffic! The situation is a scandal of the first order, not to say a source of weakness of terrifying proportions. Is England fit to win this war when she tolerates such a situation, and will she be able to win it? And the same thing applies to this country! This is an "all-out" war, we are told. Everything is upset—except only the liquor business. The automobile industry destroyed, radio production cut 60 per cent, sugar and rubber rationed, building construction stopped, colleges disrupted, men by the millions conscripted for service, homes invaded, life transformed—but the liquor business goes on absolutely untouched. Why not put the hundreds of thousands of men who are brewing beer and distilling whiskey to work at something useful? Why not take the millions of tons of grain and turn it into food? Why not convert the machinery to war production? *Why?!*

VI

The magazine, *Time,* has beaten the newspapers—or at least the newspapers I read!—in its report (March 16th) of the program for a just and durable peace formulated by the great Protestant conference held at Ohio Wesleyan University under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches. This conference was attended by 375 delegates, men of outstanding influence and importance, representing more than 30 different denominations. The high spots among the decisions reached were (1) ultimately "a world government of delegated powers," (2) complete abandonment of American isolationism, (3) strong immediate limitations on national sovereignty, (4) international control of all armies and navies, (5) "a universal system of money," (6) world-wide freedom of immigration, (7) progressive elimination of all tariff and quota restrictions on world trade, (8) "autonomy for all subject and colonial peoples," with much better treatment of American Negroes, (9) "no punitive reparations, no humiliating decrees of war guilt, no arbitrary, dismemberment of nations," and (10) a "democratically controlled international bank." Items of this kind would seem to justify *Time's* suggestion that this conference is a counterpart of the English Malvern Conference. Some of the declarations of the platform, in their extended form, are little short of sensational. Thus, the economic section, which held that "a new order of economic life is both imminent and imperative"—a new order which is sure to come either "through voluntary cooperation within the frame work of democracy or through explosive political revolution!" Without specifically condemning the profit system, the conference declared that "collectivism is coming, whether we like it or not." It is regrettable that Charles Clayton Morrison's resolution, that "the Christian church as such is not at war," adopted by a subcommittee, was not carried by the plenary session. Also, I think the editors of *Time* justified in pointing out that a conference, facile in settling the world's differences, made little progress in settling their own differences. Facing a Christian world hopelessly severed into fragments, some of them not any too friendly, the assembled churchmen did no more than call for "a new era of inter-denominational cooperation in which the claims of cooperative effort should be placed, so far as possible, before denominational prestige." Why not a world church to match a world government? But I would not end on the note of criticism. This was a wonderful conference, stamping the churches in this war with a sanity, a temperance, and a statesmanlike good will, which were never even suggested in the last war.

"The genius of American democracy is expressed in the traditional independence and freedom of our State and local schools and school systems. Their freedom of action for educational purposes must be preserved. It is upon that freedom that we hopefully depend for assurance that the judgments of our people will be soundly based."

Franklin D. Roosevelt—1941.

An Extraordinary Religion

EDWIN A. R. RUMBALL-PETRE

The personal religion of Jesus was an extraordinary religion. I am not at all convinced that it was what we today call Christianity. And it was something quite out of the ordinary to the Jews who were his contemporaries. Even today it is still the most extraordinary religion that has ever been preached to man, or that anyone has ever tried to live. I am not fully convinced that anyone else could live it, but I strongly suspect that we shall never find another teacher with anything better. Indeed, it is so adequate to the finest aspirations of humanity that there should be no surprise expressed when some of us, who try to practice his religion, affirm that it is and will be the religion of the most future ages.

If this were a sermon instead of a short study, I would be justified in selecting a text, and my text would be a curious question which Jesus is reported to have put to his disciples on one occasion, namely: "What do ye more than others?" I find that the Greek original is more brief: "What extra do ye?" There is nothing in the context of these words to lead anyone to suppose that Jesus was trying to make "holier-than-thou" proselytes. Even when he says that the righteousness of his listeners must exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, he seems to be thinking of the righteousness more than of the people who claim to have it. He virtually says: Unless your righteousness exceeds the ideas of righteousness which you yourselves have now, you cannot be my followers. No matter how good you are, you have got to be better. If he were visibly present with us now, and talking to us with our present ideas of religion, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that he would ask us the same awkward question. He would not mention Pharisees or Scribes, or any of the recognized "good people" of that earlier day. He would be up to date, up to our date, and his sermon would be a simple and sincere statement containing these words or words to this effect: Unless your righteousness exceeds the righteousness of the Christians and the church members, you cannot be my disciples. Most extraordinary, is it not? But that is what his words meant to the good folk who first heard him. We have been deceiving ourselves for ages thinking that the religion of Jesus was an "old-time religion." We have read his words as ancient words, words delivered to a people long dead. We have been so dull in our imaginations that we seldom came to the story of his life as if it had any significance for 1942. If the personal religion of Jesus is just an "old-time religion," and not a religion for this new time, then there is nothing extraordinary about it. It is just like all the other religions. Let us admit, if we must, that there are matters taught by Jesus which obviously date him as a teacher of the Near East who lived some nineteen centuries ago, wholly oblivious of the complex civilization which has developed since. It yet remains true beyond all dispute that the personal quality in his religion is deeper than every such intellectual limitation. One's personal religion is not illustrated by one's creed, nor by one's education and age. It has no measure and follows no rule. It is wholly unpredictable. For all that we have heard even from the Gospels about the Pharisees who were hypocrites, it must not be forgotten that they were the "good people" of their time. In a very real sense they were the Puritans, the Fundamentalists, of their day and country. They were always insisting on strictness in the observance of their religious duties. To them liberalism spelt laxity. They talked about the "old-time religion," they honored "the God of our Fathers," and their faithfulness to the past often made them deaf to any "news" of a religion that broke from God's word in their own day. Their religion was the "ordinary" religion. The personal religion of Jesus was extraordinary. The only reason for mentioning this fact in 1942 is that most people today profess an "ordinary" religion. It is the wholly respectable religion of the churches. Whether it calls itself Catholicism, Judaism, or Protestantism, it is a religion that gives an element of sanity, popularity, respectability to us and our families in the communities where we dwell. Instead of being the unpredictable personal religion of Jesus, it is most predictable. Everybody knows exactly what to expect from it. Its predictabilities not only include our various creeds and ways of life, but they cover all the other outward acts of religion, even to the minutest details of a service of worship. Each church member knows "the order of service," knows just "when" the priest will say "this" or do "that," just "what" the minister will do first, second, and third, when he reaches the pulpit. It would be most extraordinary if the priest or the minister failed to say or do the things that priests and ministers have done for centuries when they have conducted their people in a service of worship. What Jesus would do, if he were the priest or the minister for the day, none of us could say. We have every reason for thinking that he would depart from "the order of service." He might read from the Bible, as he is said to have done in the synagogues of his own land; on the other hand, he might not. He might engage in public prayer, yet again, he might not. He might announce his sermon the moment he entered the pulpit, which would be quite extraordinary. As for announcing, "Your offering for this morning will now be taken up by the ushers," he might forget altogether that the collection plate was part of the religious service, or he might make the words, "Judas carried the bag," the text of his sermon. He would be wholly unpredictable and extraordinary.

Of course, my illustrations are very homely, but homely illustrations were the parables of Jesus. The test of our personal religion is not to be found in the past but in the present. Not what Jesus did, but what Jesus would do now, must be the test, and to apply such a test requires not a creed so much as a little common imagination. Our problem is not how to live in Galilee but how to live in New York and Berlin. There is a common Latin phrase expressed by the two words, *mutatis mutandis*, which expresses the act of the imagination which must take place here. The phrase means "necessary changes being made," or "things which must be changed, being changed." The personal religion of Jesus, "necessary changes being made" on account of the changes in time and place, can be the personal religion of every one of us. But most of us forget to make these necessary changes.

We must change the word "Jerusalem" to Chicago or Paris. We must change the word "Pharisee" into churchmember. We must change "a certain man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho" into "a Jew who was beaten by a mob in Berlin," or into "a Negro who was lynched in the southern states of America." We must change "a certain woman who was a sinner" into "a girl of the streets," and we must think of streets on this side of the Atlantic rather than the lonely roads of Bethany. We must change "love your enemies" into "love the Germans," or, if you like, "love the communists," or "love the capitalists," or, if you are a pacifist, "love the warmongers." Most extraordinary, is it not? It must have surprised the folk who first heard Jesus to be told that they must love a Samaritan, or that they should love a Gentile. If what Jesus asks us to do today does not surprise us, then there must be something wrong with us. There are plenty of Catholics who would be surprised if they were told that they should love Protestants, and a great many Protestants who would be equally surprised if they were told to love Catholics, and lots of Christians who would be surprised if they were told to love Jews, but surprised or not, this extraordinary religion of Jesus requires it. There is no end to the surprises that will come in our experience if we try to adopt the personal religion of Jesus.

Extraordinary as the personal religion of Jesus is, it is in complete harmony with the most ancient philosophy and with the most modern understanding of human behavior. There was an ancient Greek philosopher, named Heraclitus, who in the fifth century before Christ, wrote a book, *On Nature,* of which only fragments are known to us today. His fundamental idea appears to have been expressed in the words: "All things flow." To him, flux and change were of the essence of life. His common utterance was that "Life is Being and Becoming." In more recent days we have tried to express the same thought by saying that "you cannot bathe in the same stream twice." The personal religion of Jesus was not something attached to his life, a department of his behavior, a thing of time and place, but it was his life. Religion and life were to him synonymous. Religion to him was not a seasonal employment, it was the occupation of every hour he lived. His religion and his life were "being and becoming." Each point reached by him was the stepping-stone to a fresh point farther ahead. Each peak attained but gave him the vision of higher peaks to be attained. He was always bettering his best. Life has been nothing else from the beginning. Evolution. Having found the good life, he was not content just to keep on imitating it, but he must improve it. He was no repeater. So life must be for us all, not a repetition of the past, however good it may have been, but a competition with the past. The examples which we follow must be followed to the place where we do better than the example. While we can thank God for all the good men who have ever lived, we must all the time assert with modesty: "I also am a man!" Fine as your religion may be, "what extra do ye?"—"what do ye more than others?"—more than those whose lives ye most admire?

The "surprise" element, the unpredictable element, in one's personal religion, which becomes characteristic of our religion when we undertake to make it compete with its past, has far more power to accomplish good than when our religion is a known quantity. A friend of mine recently had a talk with the personnel director of a large industry, and they fell to the discussion of what to do when one employe picked a quarrel with another. Said the director:

> If a man without provocation should strike another and he in turn be struck, then the first man emotionally has been vindicated and you have the start of a fight. But if the man who has been struck is big enough emotionally and mentally to respond without anger, he has the other fellow at a disadvantage. If he asks "What's the matter, Bill? Are you sick?" the pattern of the aggressor is broken. In words, or in action, he will probably say: "This is not what I expected." He finds himself on new ground and may be bewildered.

That is the true psychology of the matter. The pattern is broken. When Jesus said and did the things reported of him, he broke the pattern that all men expected from teachers and Messiahs. The Jews, many of them, said: "We thought he was the one who would redeem Israel," or "We hoped that he would lead a revolt against the Roman invaders," or "We supposed that he would work some miracle, call fire down from heaven, or do something else equally powerful, to show us that he was the son of God." But he broke the pattern of their expectancies and led no revolt, called no fire down from heaven, and even allowed the aggressors of his country to crucify him, not uttering one word about revenge, but even praying for his enemies, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." It was very extraordinary. The early power of his life and teaching among those first followers of his was unquestionably derived from this unpredictable element. Men were not in the habit of dealing with such a religion. The more they were persecuted, the more numerous they became. The blood of the martyrs became the seed of the church. It was all most extraordinary. Pity is that it is not still extraordinary! What has happened to us that our religion is so ordinary, so set and predictable? What have we lost that all the world knows exactly what Christians will do? I fear we all lack the personal religion of Jesus.

Let us look at just a few of the extraordinary requirements of the personal religion of Jesus. It will be recalled that he is reported to have stated that the man who indulged in wrong thoughts was in the same class as the man who gave way to wrong acts. He said that the "old-time religion" had commanded, "Thou shalt not kill," but that he went farther than that, and held that any man who was angry with his brother was equally in danger. He had another illustration, and said that the "old-time religion" commanded that a man should not commit adultery, but that he held that a man who indulged in lust was also an adulterer. In other words, he said that it is not what you do, but what you are, that determines what kind of a man or woman you must be accounted. Of course, this changes the judgment seat from the public to one's own conscience, "that of God" within each person's life. To the public, to your fellow churchmembers, you may not be a murderer or an adulterer, but what are you to yourself? It is rather extraordinary, is it not?

You will recall that on another occasion he said that we should forgive men their trespasses as God forgives us. Very few of us have ever stopped to ask: How does God forgive us? His forgiveness is the greatest in the world. It is full and free, and, let it be added, it forgets. Yes, God forgives and forgets. He holds nothing against us. He does not say: I

forgive but I am going to watch you more closely in future. He does not say: I will overlook the trouble this time, but do not let me ever catch you again doing this thing. He so completely forgives us that we are ashamed of ourselves that we ever needed forgiveness. One of the best stories told of the printing of the first Bibles in America is told of old Christopher Saur, the printer-publisher of the first Bible in America in a European language. He did not print them for profit but chiefly to supply the need of his German neighbors. Telling of his publications, he wrote:

> I am not a rich man, and do not yearn to be one, but I am regarded as rich because I always buy for cash; but I never loan anything except when I know that it will be repaid at the right time, or when a poor man has nothing and is helpless, there, I forgive him in advance and keep no books.

That is just like God. For all the talk there has been about a Judgment Day when the books will be opened, God keeps no books. He is certainly as kindly disposed to his poor men as Christopher Saur was to his Germantown neighbors. He forgives in advance. But Jesus says that that is the only kind of forgiveness. You can hardly be said to forgive a man his debt if you make him pay just the same. You can hardly be said to have forgiven your enemy if you insist that he pay you damages, or reparations, or submit securities and collateral to insure that he will be trustworthy. I appreciate that you will say that this is very unbusinesslike, that it is visionary, impractical, that it is a counsel of perfection and lacks horse sense and every kind of common sense. All I am trying to stress for the moment is that it is extraordinary, that it is part of the extraordinary religion of Jesus. If, as most Christians aver, Jesus had the power to overcome his enemies when he was arrested, it is all the more extraordinary that he did not use the power. Of course, it is difficult to predict what your enemy would think or do if you treated him with such forgiveness. It is not easy to say what the Germans would have done at the end of 1918, if the Allies had presented them with a receipted bill, stating that all indebtedness was paid, and had asked them to shake hands and be friends. I think that it would have swept the Germans off their feet. They would have thought they were dreaming. They would have pinched themselves to find out if they were awake. It would have broken their pattern of expectancies and bewildered them beyond everything they had ever before experienced. It would have been the most extraordinary peace that the world has ever known, but the chances are many that it would have lasted longer than any other peace. It is a little aside from the point to reply that such forgiveness is contrary to nature, that nature never forgives, that what a man sows he must also reap. It is aside from the point because the Germans, and the British, and the French, and the Americans, and all who do wrong, will reap what they sow, forgiveness or not. Forgiveness is not a matter of sowing and reaping. Forgiveness is a quality, a human quality that softens and eases the processes of nature. It is a kindliness which can exist between men who suffer for wrongs which they have done to each other. It will not abolish the suffering, but it can change the spirit in which each will suffer. If you simply pray daily in the Paternoster, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those that trespass against us," and do not actually forgive, do not actually forgive and forget, you are only using pious words that mean nothing. I admit that it is all very extraordinary, but Jesus evidently thought that such words should mean something.

You may recall another saying of Jesus in the Sermon of the Mount: "If a man compels you to go with him one mile, go with him twain." I do not know what this means unless it means that I must do more than is expected of me, more than I am paid for. It must have surprised that first man when his command was obeyed, and the fellow he commanded actually did go with him two miles. Naturally, he thought the fellow would resist and refuse to go, but when he did not, it broke up the aggressor's pattern of life by violence. Here was a man who not only went two miles, but evidently was in the frame of mind to go three miles if so required. What can you do with a man who is so unpredictable that you cannot make him angry by ordering him about? Jesus knew the might of the man whom no violence could scare.

I think that it is safe to assume that Jesus enjoyed surprising the folk about him with these common unpredictabilities. He loved not only to give full measure, but to press it down and let it run over. I have used some homely illustrations, let me use some more. I remember, many years ago, when some of these thoughts first dawned upon my mind, I started to practice them in a simple fashion. The first person to be a beneficiary of my changed ideas was a newsboy on the street. When I bought my evening newspaper from him, I handed him a nickel. He started to give me back the two cents change, but I said quietly, "Keep the change, the paper is worth five cents to me." He looked amazed, and as I moved away, he exclaimed, "Gee! I wish there were more guys like you!" That same day I ate my lunch in one of Childs' Restaurants, where tips are sometimes left by customers and sometimes are not. Instead of waiting till the end of the meal, I tipped the waitress when I gave my order, and I gave her fifteen per cent instead of the usual ten per cent. My reward was not only the pleasanter service that I received, but the pleasure I had in noting her astonishment. I recall the case of a man who lost his job, one that he had had for twenty years. When he was laid off he could not get a new position at once, so rather than loll about doing nothing, he reported to work every morning at his old job, and worked for three months for no wage whatever. He said that the pleasure which it gave him well repaid him. What a different world this would be if we all were intent on seeing how much we could do for nothing, or, when we were paid, intent on seeing that we did more than we were paid for! I would not limit such expressions of this extraordinary religion to employes only. If it is good for the workman, it is good for the boss. He also must undertake some of these pleasant surprises for his workers, not only by giving regular increases in wages, or bonuses at Christmas time, but doing unexpected generosities at other times. Customers also must be given a few surprises in the same way, goods that are sold must be better than the advertisements say they are, quantities must be a little overweight, and where commodities are sold by the dozen or the score, the dozen must always be thirteen or fourteen, and the score twenty-two or twenty-five. I am not concerned whether such commercial practices will "pay." I am sure that they should not be adopted because they pay. They are their own reward, like virtue.

In case any should imagine that such good will in business should be the basis of a publicity campaign

in which the business man could announce to the public that it should patronize his business because he gives overweight, or because his goods are demonstrably better than he advertises them to be, we have another little advice from Jesus on the subject. He is reported to have said, "Do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them," and there are two or three instances given in the biographies about him, showing him fleeing from publicity. When he healed a sick man, "he charged them that they should tell no man." When he asked his disciples, "Whom do men say that I am?" and Peter answered to the more direct question, "Whom do ye say that I am?" by exclaiming, "Thou art the Christ!" Jesus simply said, "Tell no man." In the Sermon on the Mount the advice is quite clear: "Let not your right hand know what your left hand doeth." In other words there must be a lot of anonymity in this extraordinary religion. The more one thinks about it, this is as it should be. God has always been "the Great Unknown," even if we think that we know a good deal about Him. "No man hath seen Him at any time." He dwells "in light unapproachable." The Jews of old never spoke His name. The greatest name that He ever gave Himself simply stated the fact of His existence: "I am that I am." It said no more. There is a divinity about anonymity. Even we poor humans are really unknown personalities. We cannot say what we are. There is mystery in both the whence and the whither of our lives. All fame is as dust. Our cemeteries are full of the stone memorials of those who have refused to believe this, but as the centuries roll on, the very sites of the cemeteries disappear and after a few thousand years, the descendants of the famous wonder if their ancestors ever lived. The first and greatest benefactors of the race are all anonymous. We do not know who first walked upright, who first communicated by words, who first smiled, who first loved, who first died that others might live. Is it any wonder that Jesus thought it more important to do good than to publicize the fact?

This extraordinary personal religion of Jesus would make many changes in our organized religious life if we took it seriously. I do not know how else one can take one's religion unless it is taken seriously. No publicity for goodness would rob a great many Christians of the motives they have for their goodness. Like the good people who first heard Jesus, they love to give "alms to be seen of man." They would feel that they were being treated unjustly if the annual report of the church or the charity society did not print their names and the amount that they gave. They would not leave much in their wills to this Foundation, or to that Association if they thought the newspapers would not report the fact. Yet it is not just a fanciful detail of the religion of Jesus, but a fundamental part of his religion that we must wear a poker face when we do good. Let no other player "see your hand," or even suspect that you have the card that will win the game. I knew a man years ago who had what I would call "a secret virtue." He was rich and after his retirement from business, he spent part of each day going through the newspaper selecting two or three names of people whose acts, or words, pleased him, or whose condition seemed worthy, and arranging with his bank to send them cashier's checks for various amounts, sometimes quite large. They never knew who sent them the money, for the bank was under strict obligation to keep the secret. I found out, because I was once one of the recipients, and I knew that he was the only man in the city who was acquainted with the need to which he asked me to devote it. He was one of the happiest old men that I ever knew.

I will mention but one more of the important factors in this extraordinary religion, namely, the teaching of Jesus that we should "do good" to those that hate us, and that if we have a hungry enemy, we should feed him; if he is thirsty, we should quench his thirst. It is as if Jesus knew that merely telling people to love their enemies, would lead only to a sentimentalism. He must have known that simply to tell men to forgive their foes was not enough, for a great many people make forgiveness merely a mental hypnotism. They say, sometimes grudgingly, "Oh, yes, I forgive him," and that is the end of it. But not for Jesus, that is only the beginning. The next step is practical, "Do good" to those who despitefully use you, "and say all manner of evil against you falsely." Extraordinary, is it not? He does not say do good to them after they have stopped persecuting you, but while they still hurt you, return good for evil. This means, if it means anything, that the Armenian must set himself the task of doing some good thing for the Turk. It means that the Jew must likewise start being a philanthropist to the anti-Semite, it means that the Negro in our southern states and elsewhere must find ways and means of being kind and good to members of the Ku Klux Klan. It means that Fascists and Nazis and others like them must plan for the highest good of those whom they think are "the scum of the earth." It means simply that men must believe in the Golden Rule. Extraordinary, is it not? So many of us thought that the Golden Rule, that returning good for evil, was just a pleasant theory, just a utopian fancy, and that it was never meant to be a rule of life.

I know that someone will ask me what I think of the proposal recently made by an English bishop, who wishing to follow the teaching of Jesus about feeding the enemy, wanted to send food to the Germans, and sought to have his country take this action, on the theory that England was a Christian nation. I do not find that Jesus had much if anything to say about politics, or what nations should do for each other. He went after the problems of life by tackling the individual. He seemed to have had the extraordinary idea that if you can change the individual you thereby change the nation, that if you have enough individuals changed the national problems will take care of themselves in consequence. Frankly, if you are in a hurry, if you think that it is up to your generation to make the world perfect, then this extraordinary notion of Jesus is quite impractical. It will take too long. If we are getting near to the end of the world and something must be done quickly to save mankind, then perhaps we had best have recourse to law and force, and seek our ends by political and national means. But if we will once admit the all too obvious fact, that life is taking its own time to grow, that many millenniums fill up the space between "being" and "becoming," then it will appear that for any kind of success, you can only deal with the individual. There are no Christian nations. There is no race that follows the teaching of Jesus. There are only individuals, in every land under the sun, who feel that this most extraordinary religion is practical and can be lived and lived successfully. For them the teaching is absolute, "When thine enemy hungers, feed him!" He would say that that is the only thing one can do to a hungry enemy. It is the only way known

to man to convert an enemy into a friend. All the centuries of human conflict, all the statesmanship of the world's greatest leaders, all the schemes of the most successful conquerors and politicians, have never discovered any way to make an enemy into a friend except this extraordinary way taught by Jesus. The fact that it is hard to practice, that it is humiliating, that it hurts our pride and seems to debase our national honor, is beside the point. There is nothing else to do. Killing the enemy does not make him a friend. Making him sign a treaty of peace will not make him into a friend. Garrisoning soldiers about his home will not change him into a friend. Disarming him will not do it. Nothing will do it except being good to him. If there were but one untried way other than the method suggested by Jesus, I would say, let us postpone this hard thing that Jesus asks us to do, and try it, but there is not known to man even one way other than his way. Why not try it? Of course, it would surprise everyone, the enemy most of all. It would break up the pattern of all his expectancies, but coming out of his bewilderment, more might come than ever came out of a peace conference.

In closing it might be well to ask: Why does Jesus teach such an extraordinary religion? His answer is to be found alongside of the extraordinary teachings he utters: "That ye may become the true sons of your Father, for He causes His sun to rise on the good men and on the evil ones, and sends His rain upon those who do wrong and on those who do good." In other words, he holds up Nature as one with God, or, to put it another way, he asserts that God acts naturally, not supernaturally. If God makes none of the distinctions which we make between those who deserve good and those who deserve evil, then it is not unnatural for us to do good to all whether they deserve it or not. I am afraid that there are two kinds of people who will have great difficulty in accepting this extraordinary personal religion of Jesus, those who will say that it is all right for Jesus to have such a personal religion, but that it is impossible for any human being to possess such; and second, those whose thoughts have been vitiated with long theological theories that have sought to persuade men that religion was fundamentally something about a right belief rather than a right way of living. The answer to the first is that Jesus speaks of these things as matters that vitally concern humanity rather than as matters that concern only himself. And the answer to the second will be found, and can only be found, not in argument but in trying to live the kind of extraordinary life that Jesus commends. He who was charged with being the friend of "publicans and sinners," which *mutatis mutandis* means "grafters and crooks," knew humanity as deeply as most of us. He was no sheltered, cloistered teacher far removed from the haunts of men. He knew what we did when we did wrong, and he knew how beautiful and strong we could be when we did right. The most practical aspect of his divinity was his power to divine the depths and the heights of humanity, and since his day we have had a few, all too few, illustrations of men and women who have actually practiced what he preached. They were extraordinary people, not extraordinary in their powers, but extraordinary because they believed that Jesus actually meant what he said. Most of us just do not believe that he meant it, and, consequently, we do not try to follow him. Until we do, I see absolutely no hope for humanity. His way of life is the only way, the only truth, the only life that is worth while.

The Flight from Reason*

F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

One of the most marked characteristics of the present day is that of the growth of irrationalism. There is a new distrust of the liberal principle of rationality. The fact that an opinion is unreasonable has ceased in some quarters to be a necessary criterion for its acceptance or dismissal. The movement has gone on side by side with a decrease of the acceptance of the attitude of liberality. Intolerance and a refusal to see a question in every aspect is always the companion of irrationalism.

These considerations are most strongly marked in fields of opinion which deal with the really important spheres of human endeavor. The significance of Fascism as a political movement is that it represents the extreme limit of reaction and irrationalism within government. The individual is standardized by a relentless state-worship which refuses him any other place than that of a cog in a machine. Similarly in religion, the progress of irrationalism is strongly marked. The rise of religious philosophies which degrade man or which pay scant regard to the human reason is a sign of the times. The pessimistic years which followed the close of the last war have left a mark which a second World War has intensified. The striking progress of neo-Catholic and of neo-Calvinistic views of Christian orthodoxy is significant. The somewhat fluffy forms of emotional Evangelicalism, which had become characteristic of orthodox Protestant theology, have now given place to definite schemes of doctrine emphasizing specific world views. Logic and consistency are frequently substituted within such schemes for rational inquiry.

The flight from reason has a long ancestry.

The struggle between Catholicism and a rationalistic liberalism is the most important note in English theology during the second half of the last century. It is this antithesis which renders Cardinal Newman and Doctor Martineau the two most significant religious thinkers of the time. Either the tradition must be accepted whole and entire or reason and liberality must be allowed to act as a solvent upon it.

By the close of the century, the issue seemed finished.

The work of Auguste Sabatier in philosophy, of Harnack in dogmatics and New Testament criticism, of the scholars of Germany, Holland, France, and America, went far to suggest that the intellectual battle was won. The valuations implied by Christianity must attain a new integration in terms of a liberal view of the evolution of the universe, of man and human progress, of society as an evolving factor. Conscience, reason, and

*In view of the current controversy over the relative values of rationality and irrationality in religion, the readers of UNITY will be interested in this statement by Mr. Micklewright, which appeared in a recent issue of the *Inquirer*, London.—C. W. R.

emotion formed the basic authorities for religion. Comparison and experiment supplied the methods by which they might work.

From one point of view, the growth of factual knowledge which gave sanction to a liberal approach has never been disproved. No scientist would desire to go back behind Darwin and T. H. Huxley. Literature has illustrated the growth of humanism. The few poets and men of letters who have slipped back into a reactionary frame of mind might be matched by the many who have insisted upon moving forward. In philosophy, it is not such figures as the Archbishop of York who count in the last resort. It finds its authorities in such names as Santayana, Laird, or Alexander. In Biblical Criticism, Loisy, Guignebert, Goguel, and Kirsopp Lake have continued the work commenced by the older liberal scholars. At the same time, within religious activity, the flight from reason is in full swing. There is a reaction against liberal valuations of man and the universe. Reinhold Niebuhr is loud in his criticisms of humanism in any form. Barth degrades man by refusing to consider his reason as of any worth. Their imitators assert old orthodoxies with a fresh dogmatism. Mr. Lewis discusses the problem of pain and evil in terms of the fall of man as if the name of Darwin had never been heard. The wide prevalence of dogmatism in the political sphere is another example of the same process. It is not without significance that the age is one which has seen the recurrence of foolish cults, such as astrology, to an astounding degree. Irrationalism in thought has transmitted itself to the many in terms of sheer superstition.

The place of the liberal in religion is difficult. It is an interim period and further advance is not to be expected during a time of chaos. He is the heir to the advances of the last century. It is his especial province to demand that tests of rationality and liberality shall be applied to religious demands, in whatever shape they may appear. But, he must go further in his contest with irrationalism. If religious liberalism is to justify itself in terms of rationality and of individuality, it must effect a synthesis of its specific values with the prevailing culture of the day. It needs to justify anew its characteristic positions. The attacks upon its position have a long ancestry. It is this fact which goes far to suggest that the present flight from reason has had its predecessors through several centuries. The much-heralded defeat of liberalism may not prove to be as decisive as its opponents imagine.

The seriousness of the present issues for religious thought cannot be overestimated. Such emotional cults as Buchmanism are a sign of the general disregard of the place of reason in religion. The tendency to standardize man and reduce the individual to a dull and colorless average is as marked in this field as elsewhere. Religion conceived along the lines of neo-orthodoxy can only end by producing some form of mystery-cult, attractive to its devotees but estranged from culture as a whole. The need of the present is that preparations should be made for a post-war planning in religious thought which may rebuild it in terms of the liberal values and may again render it relevant to the needs of the whole man—to intelligence as well as to will and emotion.

Religion Is Natural

ARCHIE J. BAHM

Religion is natural. The concept of the supernatural is superfluous. To be supernatural seems to mean to be in some sense unnatural. But there is nothing that is unnatural. All is natural and is and moves and has its being according to its nature. If there is a God, he is natural, and he acts according to his nature. He and his nature are a part, if not all, of the totality of nature. The concept of supernatural tends to lead to misunderstanding. One aim of religion is to help people feel united with the world. But to conceive God as super, above, beyond, and away is to conceive him as distant, different, disunited from his own world. Such indoctrination makes for mystery and for magical methods of conjuring him back to us. When these methods seem to fail, one is led to feel that the highway to heaven is hopelessly hard. So often supernatural conceptions lead to a conviction of sin by the sinless, create suffering among the innocent, build a wall of separation between a soul and its fellows. Thus, in a sense, supernatural religion is irreligion.

Religion is natural also in the sense that men came by it naturally. It is natural for men to develop religion. If human culture were wiped out entirely and only two newborn babes contrived to live and to propagate a new race and develop a new culture, religion would naturally reappear. Efforts at environmental adjustment naturally bring faiths in familiar successes. The tried becomes trusted. The well-known yields feelings of certainty and security. But fear follows failure. Both frustration and the unfamiliar force feelings of uncertainty and insecurity. The known comes to be considered natural. The unknown is mysterious. The desire for security naturally leads men to seek to come to friendly terms with the mysterious. So long as the primitive tendency to personify powers persists, the unknown tends to be personified as potential friend or potential enemy. Depersonalization of powers proceeds as expansion of knowledge makes men less afraid. Yet, naturally, as long as some men know of a fearable unknown, religion of some sort must remain.

Definition

Past all the creeds and questions waits one work one man must do;
The present is an unplowed land our fathers could not view.
No blade of next year's grass can drink one drop of last year's dew;
The sail that waits at three o'clock forgets the wind at two;
Each truth must tunnel as it goes the rock it travels through.
From life's insistent lexicon we learn that now means new.
Creeds die too late; all quests must wait, or cry what's here to do.

MIMS THORNBURGH WORKMAN.

Cry of the Unknown Soldier of Today

To win the war we must win the peace
Peace—when the world has faith again!

There is a battlefield, a new frontier
Not only the war,
A greater fight—the afterwards.
Once we failed.
We have this fray.
Ah Peace!
Lovely, lovely word
So empty now.
So frail, so weak,
So strong with promise . . .
Yet now?
Now we are poised on a cliff
Bent with sorrow
Arms flung to the elements
Crying for a prime
Begging for one true belief
A cloudless shield
An untainted breath
An eagle's force
To wing us to the stars.
We moan
A shrill Cry to the senseless
Rill, galleoned moon
And vacant star,
Far echoes the sob.
Winds pass it to wind
Trees shudder at its breath.
The answer to our rending plea?
We stand poised on a cliff . . .

To win the war we must win the peace
Peace—when the world has faith again!

Youth feels no rumbling of the drums
As in the past.
Youth feels its waste and weakness
Knows its bloody, beastly call.
Here is the Unknown Soldier of today,
He's just a boy
Out of School this year
Wants to marry and settle down
Have children and teach them truth
And valor and beauty born.
He wants a little home and a bit of music
And to enjoy the secret sharing with his wife.

They had planned to wed in the spring
When all nature seeks each to the other.
But he answered the call to grimmer arms
And wrote on maneuvers:
"Darling, [he said to the girl]
We toured about the capital.
In Arlington Cemetery
I saw the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier
White and cold in the sun.
And thought 'These dead have died in vain.'
Thousands of men dying for an ideal—
Perhaps different ideals—
But all of them unrealized.

To what fools listen the peoples of the earth!
Religion and racial prejudice are barriers
That have formed battlefields.
Why must always one degrading creature
Bring to life old half-forgotten hatreds
And plunge the world Backward in its course
Deflecting it from the path of peace and civilization!

Darling,
Don't worry about my being a coward,
I'm not afraid to die.
It's just that if we go to war and I be killed,
I and millions of other men like me—
Well, I know that it shall be in vain.
Unless . . .
Hope is yet despair.

There was a man named Wilson once
(A common name)
Who shone with fourteen points
That would have been history's remaking.
We would not see, we turned away from our neighbors,
Our land was full and safe.
But waters shrink
And closer comes the foreign shore.
Help was needed long ago.
So our tribute to the tolling bell
Comes a little late, but a great deal higher.
Wilson knew and we must learn,
To win the war we must win the peace
Peace—when the world has faith again!

They call us the lost generation,
We can make our way
But to make our way we must be . . .
Let's say—less practical?
Rediscover a new element called 'Spiritual'
As Plato knew it,
Ideas of Justice and Beauty and Good
Religion with a capital 'R'
A part of life
A common faith
As Christ said too,
Age old and worn by lip-servicing,
'Do unto others as you would have them
Do unto you.'
Age old and worn
But never tried."

Thus speaks the Unknown Soldier of today.

That Unknown Soldier of today
Would feel a peace
Even to die and know
That we had won
And the world had faith again.
Ah Faith! (a much bandied word)
Faith is belief in something beyond our little hour,
Faith is wonder at the sweet breath of dawn.
Faith sees the dewyness of tears
And glory of love.
Faith is a self-sustaining flow
And takes a man for his goodness and grace
Not for his Religion and Race,
And gives him a hand
As a fellow worker.

That Unknown Soldier of today
Would feel a peace
Even to die and know
That:
Not Nationalism
But Internationalism,
Not brotherhoods
But a Brotherhood,
Not Catholic, Protestant, and Jew
But a Common Faith
Built on love of man
And helping thy neighbor
Would envelop the world.
In the words of the prophet,
"Not sacrifice to God,
But Justice to men!"

That Unknown Soldier of today
Would feel a peace
Even to die and know
That:
There will be a song some day—sung
That's just a whispered melody now.
For death stands in the doorway
A scimiter stained and bloody in his hand.
"Reap with love," he says,
"Everyone Free and Equal.
Hate destroys even itself—
Waiting I stand,
Nature teaches this:
All are equal in the end
For Death is a Democracy."

There are dreams
That Youth build.
And the world must see. . .

We have a trust with the Unknown Soldier,
He'll win the war,
We must win the peace
And show the world faith again.

ELIZABETH ARTHUR MANN.

The Promise of an Unconquerable France

DAVID JOBMAN

The impenetrable pathos of a shackled and enslaved France—her inescapable pains, fears, and secret hopes—now prostrated and systematically exploited by the resourceful brutalities of a merciless military conqueror, is fully mirrored in the eccentric life, unique progressive aspirations and struggles of one of her own sons. Rousseau, the great French philosopher and Voltaire's contemporary, made his significant public appearance in Paris in the year 1741, two hundred years ago, and became the crowned spokesman of modern democracy by stirring to life and action an awakened humanity and a New France then in the making.

Jean Jacques Rousseau was born in the year 1712, in the harsh environment of Calvinistic Geneva, at the beginning of a great century. Not knowing defeatism, he put into his passing years meaning and purpose, kindling a will to action, which became the stepping-stone for a generation headed towards a new era of industrial progress, universal enlightenment, and political reform. Disregarding ancient dogmas shielding many a social injustice and crime, he preferred the uneasy paths of reason, freedom of thought, and freedom of expression. To express himself fully, Rousseau had done a lot of writing; and of his published classics we may well say that they have been used for a century and a half as "the arsenal of democracy." Grasping the fundamental truth that man is a social being by his very creation, he could not fail to realize that human behavior, human motives, nay, even human instincts, habits, and morals are conditioned, modified, propelled by social rules, regulations, inhibitions, and general environment,—all subject to change by natural opportunities, human will, and intelligence. Hence, his emphasis upon social responsibility in his blueprint, the *Social Contract,* himself apparently trusting in the truths and possibilities his speculations penned therein. He tried to impress upon mankind the practicability of a most abundant life for all, believing in his own way with John Quincy Adams, that "the eternal and immutable laws of justice and of morality are paramount to all human legislation." Naturally, in his ideal world of the greater good, tyranny was outlawed, oppression inconceivable, persecution or injustice of any kind impossible. And it was the Frenchman's aspiration to locate man—the gregarious and thinking animal—in the perspective of a historically free, simple, naturally moral and pure life, doing his uncorrupted best under the guidance of an inspiring, naturally free, simple moral society democratically ordained by good will and enlightened public opinion, offering full justice to all.

The epoch-making notes of the *Social Contract* appeared when the author was fifty years old. And its supreme service to humanity is attested by the very historical fact that the core of the American Declaration of Independence and the Preamble to the Federal Constitution of the United States breathe the identical faith which guided the Frenchman's works and thoughts. It was the new nation in the Western Hemisphere, comprising the original Thirteen American Colonies, which set the example of the workability of his ideal by actually translating into life, with blood and action, the dream which was the passion of the immortal son of unconquerable France.

Rousseau identifies the will of the people with their government: they are an insoluble and indivisible one. The will of the people and government by free consent of the governed are the basic pillars of his ideal commonwealth. He makes social institutions, laws, and general will fuse into a harmonious whole, synonymous with the integrity, sanctity, and full development of personal and social life. He makes us understand or feel that human actions are prompted by the training and beliefs environmentally imbibed,—an important historical phenomenon which society through its laws and universal opinion and consent can amend and make to serve moral ends, leading towards universal security, welfare, and peaceful creative living.

"It is useless," says Rousseau, "to distinguish the character of a nation from the objects of its esteem. . . . In all the nations of the world it is not nature but

opinion which decides the choice of their pleasures. Reform men's opinions and their manners will be purified of themselves." In other words, mankind is what it is made to be by those responsible at the helm of the Ship of State. "The opinions of a nation," reasons the author of the *Social Contract,* "spring from its constitution. Although the law does not regulate morality, it is legislation that gives it birth, and when legislation becomes impaired, morality degenerates. . . ." And he asks: "What is the object of political association?" A simple answer tells his story: "It is the preservation and prosperity of its members." And in the hands of the American pioneers under Washington and his aides, the Frenchman's ideal and ideas were translating themselves into an immediate quest for the establishment of a government to guarantee more perfect union among civilized men and their communities; to establish more and wider justice in the relations of citizens; to insure domestic tranquility; to provide for common defense; to promote the general welfare; and to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Thus Rousseau's dream of Utopia became an American-made reality for immediate devotion and experimentation. Rousseau published his formula in the year 1761; the Constitution of the United States was framed in the year 1787; so the American patriots and pioneers had more than a quarter of a century to read it, to elaborate upon its implications, and to justify it before the final ratification took place for actual execution. The French philosopher, once having scattered the seeds of democratic sovereignty and government by consent of the governed, had done the great deed and his lion's share for the onward march of mankind. Even the wide and treacherous ocean could not stop their dissemination and the taking of their strongest roots.

How would Rousseau meet the present assaults upon the rights of conquered nations and their national and racial minorities? Says our author: "There is but one law which by its nature requires unanimous consent, that is, the social compact; for civil association is the most voluntary act in the world; every man being born free and master of himself, no one can, under any pretext whatever, enslave him without his assent. . . ." Here is the Magna Charta of a free citizen in a living democracy demanding his personal and social rights in a free world! To impress his readers, the Frenchman says further: "The unvarying will of all the members of the State is the general will; it is through that that they are citizens and free." Men like leadership; and they do not hesitate to follow their leaders—to shame or to glory, to death or to a nobler life. Set the stage, make the precept, point to the example; give the opportunity, and they will gladly follow. As H. G. Wells indicated in *The Fate of Man,* "the herd instinct is very strong in the human animal. It will follow a leader or stampede like a cow, and find great relief from perplexity in doing so." And since there is no escape from leadership for a long time to come, our French philosopher also had his great day of far-reaching leadership, making his appeal to man's rational and nobler faculty, and not to his lower instincts.

Living humanity must be free to will, to aspire, to expand, and to act. Obstacles and persecution might and do retard progressive living, but they can never halt the march of the mighty urge towards greater and fuller accomplishment. Hence, the function of law in orderly society, according to Rousseau, is to serve as a barometer to achievement. In that ideal order, the Frenchman willed, legislation must be on constant guard to prevent ill practices which are detrimental to social unity, social security and peace. So he visualized laws guaranteeing "moderation in property and influence, and, on the part of ordinary citizens, repression of avarice and covetousness." He hoped that a liberal education and a native feeling of simple sublime religion could and would instill a moral self-discipline as well as a spirit of tolerance cementing such an order. He recorded his conviction that social power and its use "should fall short of all violence, and never be exercised except by virtue of station and of laws; while as to wealth, no citizen should be rich enough to be able to buy another, and none poor enough to be forced to sell himself. . . ." And in a footnote to Book II, Chapter XI in his *Social Contract,* the author gives us the very key to his philosophy:

> If, then, you wish to give stability to the State, bring the two extremes as near together as possible; tolerate neither rich people nor beggars. These two conditions, naturally inseparable, are equally fatal to the general welfare; from the one class spring tyrants, from the other, the supporters of tyranny; it is always between these that the traffic in public liberty is carried on; the one buys and the other sells.

This very problem still remains the riddle of the ages, still unsolved and disturbing the repose of many an earnest statesman. Being a good diagnostician does not necessarily mean being timely with a healing cure!

> If we ask precisely [writes Rousseau] wherein consists the greatest good of all, which ought to be the aim of every system of legislation, we shall find that it is summed up in two principal objects, LIBERTY and EQUALITY, liberty, because any individual dependence is so much force withdrawn from the body of the State; equality, because liberty cannot subsist without it.

He felt that it is under democratic living that they are guaranteed; and it is in the interests of the social order to maintain these precious gifts which make decent, free living possible.

Trusting the fate of mankind to the workings of common sense and good will, the Frenchman looked at the legislative and executive powers of organized society as the true channels through which the general will and the common good can function most faithfully. "The legislative power is the heart of the State; the executive power is its brain, giving movement to all the parts." And "nothing is, or ought to be, done in it without their cooperation." As outlined by the author of the *Social Contract,* laws always are and by every good reason ought to be the open receptacles through which a free and enlightened public opinion serves human needs; translating the general aspirations of humanity into concrete, everyday, practical forms for universal application and enjoyment.

Rousseau believed in the evolutionary processes of social progress. He felt that only through progressive change can human stability and happiness be achieved; while in peaceful and intelligent application of laws expressing the general will he recognized the sole agent for the accomplishment of all desirable aims.

> If we wish to form a durable constitution, [we read in his notes], let us, then, not dream of making it eternal. In order to succeed we must not attempt the impossible, nor flatter ourselves that we are giving to the work of men a stability which human things do not admit of.

It was in full accord with this reasoning and this ideal, and acting upon these principles, that James Madison and his friends, who perfected the original draft of the Constitution of the United States and the Bill of Rights, had inserted the entire Article V in the "supreme law of the land," dedicated to the provision for unlimited

amendments in the administration of the legislative and progressive needs of the new nation.

Rousseau was a true realist with full confidence in man's ability to be master of his fate, once he sets his shoulders and his living ethics to the task.

> The constitution of man [says he] is the work of nature; that of the State is the work of art. It does not rest with men to prolong their lives; it does rest with them to prolong that of the State as far as possible, by giving it the best constitution practicable. . . .

There is no ambiguity, neither in the words nor in the logic nor in the performance. As to those whose ignorance or ill-design attempts to belittle human nature, questioning man's abilities to create his own better life, —for them the French philosopher leaves this lashing reference for instruction:

> The limits of the possible in moral things are less narrow than we think; it is our weaknesses, our vices, our prejudices, that contract them. Sordid souls do not believe in great men; vile slaves smile with a mocking air at the word LIBERTY.

Let us reread these last lines and feel the full weight of their scathing censure, so aptly spoken for our own age, where the very existence of democratic principles is brought to trial by a world beset with assaulting tyrannies.

Rousseau knew that he was ahead of his times. He himself tells us, "I am far removed from ordinary ideas . . ." Yet he ardently believed in the possibility of a moral social order serving in an intelligent and peaceful manner the physical, spiritual, and aesthetic needs of a rational society. The simple education of character and the free social contract which he advocated were promise enough for a universal appreciation and acceptance of the principles and hopes he enunciated. As a reformer, he strikes the social balance in this manner: "The better constituted a State is, the more do public affairs outweigh private ones in the minds of the citizens." And there is no fear that the individual will lose his identity, falling prey to a collective monster-dictator. Categorically the author of the *Social Contract* says: ". . . the person of the meanest citizen is as sacred and inviolable as that of the first magistrate. . . ." At all times, he maintains, the "assemblies of the people" were to remain "the shield of the body politic and the curb of the government." Such was the language and thus went the aspirations of the immortal spokesman of the great French democracy. His spirit was carried across the seas to the New World by that other great Frenchman, the Marquis de LaFayette, who, in the year 1777, left his native France to join cause with Washington and his daring Americans.

Like all great leaders, Rousseau knew the temper of his people. He knew their needs, and joined them in their better aims. He had the feeling that if the people are permitted to follow their better instincts they will take the right path for the good of humanity as well as their individual security and happiness. But he also knew that without a free citizenship expressing its desires and serving its needs through the medium of intelligent discussion and consent by peaceful legislation, practicing understanding and generosity, there naturally can be no self-respecting free society. The democratic principles of political freedom and the liberal principles of a living faith made possible that very materialization of a life built on fellowship and human helpfulness. Since no normal person is expected to work against his own happiness, neither would a truly civilized and religious society work against the true interests of any mother's son and the security of its own moral foundations. Pleads Rousseau: "People the territory uniformly, extend the same rights everywhere. spread everywhere abundance and life; in this way the State will become at once the strongest and the best governed that may be possible."

The appearance of the working democracy of the United States of America, despite the deeply-rooted shortcomings of local character and custom, offers ample evidence vindicating the truthfulness and just claims of the Frenchman's contentions and promises.

At the age of sixty-six, on July 2, 1778, two days before the second anniversary of the momentous Declaration announcing the birth of the American Democracy, Jean Jacques Rousseau died. His very departure, like the present misfortunes of France, was merely a temporary lowering or baptism of the curtain to shield passing agonies of a vanquished body,—only immediately to rise again to a new life of valor, moral strength, and ultimate victory. Physically, he passed away more than a century and a half ago, but his name and soul make "a burning and a shining light," ever close to us and ever "present in spirit."

Samuel Johnson reminds us that "the chief glory of every people arises from its authors." Prompted by an inner light, Rousseau chalked up an original (even though premature) text or equation for his formula of human improvement and social progress, namely—humanity plus democracy plus simplicity and undogmatic education equal the ideal Humane Society of Tomorrow. He made mankind conscious of their better selves, their finer opportunities ahead of them; prompting them to creative thought, fuller effort, and nobler sentiments. There was the promise for a final victory in the battle for the right, the just, the humane, the simple, and the beautiful. The Frenchman actually managed to synchronize human passions and joys with the thrilling majesties of a better nature. He sang eloquently in prose the lyrics of his impulsive melodies, —symphonies which echoed in the hearts of his fellow men. His gospel of nature was heard and copied with delight and universal acclaim. Thus modern romanticism was born. His religion of nature and wholesome simplicity became the bright star of liberal thought and movements throughout the world. Deism and progressive education thus found open expression in the lives of multitudes that read him. And wherever statesmen and thinkers and seekers after wisdom met in earnest discussion, there his ideas of republicanism advocating the democratic sovereignty of the people became the heated topic of the day. Thus modern social and political democracy was born, to the chagrin of the tyrants of the Old World. Whether as the author of *Julie* or *Emile,* or as architect of the notes embracing his utopian *Social Contract,* he became the inspiration behind the Declaration of the Rights of Man, also the acknowledged "bastion of strength," offering timely encouragement to Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin and their friends in the Thirteen American Colonies, who, under the leadership of the self-sacrificing George Washington, had set out to right human wrongs in the only possible manner worldly despots can be made to understand.

The endurance and future of France, like the undying fame of Rousseau, as well as the future of all progressive, peace-loving, and democratic humanity, must forever be guided and guaranteed by moral daring and light; by more freedom and friendship; more universal security and cooperation. The very calendar of the times declares that *le diable boiteux*—the lame devil of

all injustice, of all immortality, of all oppression—must be banished from modern life. It is high time that wisdom, decency, and enduring peace be the rule and not the problematical exception. In full truth, as a leading editorial in The New York *Times* (July 27, 1941) authentically reminds us, "There can be peace on earth. The earth is rich enough for every one who inhabits it. Men can turn it into abundance and create a good life all over the world by the use of will and intelligence." Where is the stumbling-block, then? Such indeed was the opinion and the vision and the hope of Rousseau; and such must be the hope of the New France to rise from the ordeal of the second World War with its unpardonable crimes and gruesome visitations. France has fallen:—Long live France! For France, like humanity, is unconquerable.

The Study Table

The Return to the Cross

THE RETURN TO RELIGION. *By Henry C. Link. New York: The Macmillan Company.* 181 *pp. Now* $1.00.
IN THE SHADOW OF THE CROSS. *By Frederick K. Stamm. New York: The Macmillan Company.* 141 *pp.* $1.50.

These two books, one a reprint, one just published, belong together. Link's *The Return to Religion* has been read by at least a million people, and several millions more can now read it, since it is reissued for one dollar. When this book first appeared William Lyon Phelps was one of its reviewers, and he said that every American ought to read it. Not only every American but also every person touched by any difficulty ought to read it. This book is simply-put practical theology for the masses. It is written by one who calls himself a psychologist, an unfortunate term in this case, since it will keep some people from reading the book. It is written by a man who found that religion can solve problems.

And now Doctor Stamm has written a companion volume to put a theology into what Doctor Link discovered. Lest someone should let the word theology scare him away from this book, let the reviewer define theology. Everybody is, at times, a theologian. A person is a theologian when he thinks of the meaning of life, death, and God. In these realms the average person easily loses his way. Right here, Doctor Stamm, who is one of America's greatest preachers, comes to everyman's help. His book is a simply and beautifully written exposition of Christianity. The reviewer wishes he were a millionaire so he could buy these books and distribute them to those who otherwise might never hear about them, but who, once having read them, would forever be different men and women.

□ □ □ □

A Spiritual Ministry

THE CHRISTIAN HAS WINGS. *By W. E. Sangster. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 153 pp. $1.50.*

This is a worthwhile book with a theme that ought to be much pondered. The author, W. E. Sangster, is pastor of Central Hall, Westminster, London. He has lived for months in an air raid shelter in London, trying to comfort the bereaved and the homeless. Wendell Willkie on his recent trip to England visited him.

Doctor Sangster has selected the "war aims" as expressed by various spokesmen for the Democracies. His list of objects for which men still fight in 1942 is: a new order, security, democracy, spiritual things, justice, progress, freedom, peace, decency, life. Some day historians will collect the "war aims" of the others. The author concludes:

> Neither soldiers nor statesmen can achieve the new world-order alone. If the Church fails, all their "blood, toil, tears, and sweat" will be unavailing. . . . Only new men, working under God, can make new societies and a new world.

C. A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

"Mere Nose-Counting" in Plan for Union Now

TO UNITY:

At a recent round table discussion where one of the speakers was an advocate of Federal Union, one question from the audience was substantially: "In deciding on the basis of representation in the proposed union, what merit, if any, would you ascribe to having representation depend partly on the volume of international trade of a member nation? Would not such a criterion tend to encourage automatically the breaking down of trade barriers, by rewarding those who broke them down and reducing the representation of those who did not?"

And without hesitation the advocate of Federal Union condemned the suggestion, stating that it violated directly a fundamental principle of democracy—universal suffrage and majority rule.

The question is raised, not as a matter of advocating the suggestion, (it might involve drawbacks not greatly less than the advantages), but as an illustration of the dogmatism of the speaker, and to develop a few of the drawbacks of the alleged fundamental principle so rigidly relied on.

What magic is there in mere nose-counting of individuals, on problems where most of us do not know enough to make a decision that is reasoned *or* intelligent? If 52 of 100 men vote to go North, and 48 vote to go South, have we not automatically reduced the intelligence level of the decision to that of the *least* intelligent members of the group? Is it not probable that if the 100 selected by ballot a committee of 15 *with authority to act,* who are considered by their fellows best informed on the problem, the decision might be not to go anywhere for a time, and then to go East? And which of the decisions would be most likely to be an advantageous one?

Yet the advocates of Federal Union propose to exclude nations who do not qualify as "democratic" according to their definition! Insistence on the "fundamental principle" would limit membership to the nations they would no doubt like to see in *sole* control of the union, and enable the union to exert on non-members pressures no less drastic than those exerted on the conquered after the first World War. And it would furnish a firm foundation for rationalizing such pressures. Instead of penalizing the losers we would merely be insisting on "democracy."

Our Puritan forefathers escaped from a tyranny based on a religious dogma, and the "freedom" they established was a new tyranny as rigorous as the old—only the dogma was a different one. Federal Union seems to have many of the same earmarks.

D. H. SWEET.

Chicago, Illinois.